

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 9, 2004 LB 969

SENATOR CHAMBERS: There had to have been some policy reason for keeping cities and villages from entering these types of activities. Do you know what that policy decision was based on when the original language had been adopted?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Senator Chambers, I do not know what the policy decision was at that time, and if there...

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Chambers, are you...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Oh, I thought he was going to answer further.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Schrock.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is there some problem that was perceived to exist if cities and villages were allowed to engage in this activity? In my mind, there must have been some problem that was thought to exist.

SENATOR SCHROCK: Well,...

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Because of a change in circumstances, apparently, that problem no longer is perceived to be there. Now that is speculation on my part. Do you have more comment you'd like to make?

SENATOR SCHROCK: Senator Chambers, I'm not sure I can directly answer that question, but the bonding people believe that we need this in statutes so that this plant can be bonded. Now, we don't know of any statutes that prohibit this from taking place, but Dillon's law in the past has prevailed when we're dealing with public power districts. And so they thought the prudent thing to do was come to the Legislature and make sure that we specifically authorize the cost sharing of a facility like this. I hope that helps.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: It does. It does. It helps in explaining why this approach is being taken in the bill. Exactly what is going to be allowed under this bill, because as I look at the committee statement I see where it says if another public entity